

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are amended and Claim 14 is added in the present amendment. Amended Claims 1, 5, and 9 and new Claim 14 are supported by the original disclosure and, thus, add no new subject matter.¹

The specification is amended to correct informalities.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP0790560 (herein "EP560").

Applicant and Applicant's representatives thank Examiner Peyton for the courtesy of an interview with Applicant's representatives on March 27, 2007 during which time the issues in the outstanding Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized herein. While no formal agreement was reached on patentability, Examiner Peyton agreed to consider the present amendment in view of the discussion during the interview.

As discussed during the interview, Amended Claim 1 defines an **interface circuit** capable of accessing data stored over multiple sectors within card-type memory, buffering the data within the interface circuit, and transmitting the data from the interface circuit to an electronic device including a printer, copying machine and/or a facsimile.

EP560 describes a prefetch function *within the I/O card* that allows the I/O card to buffer data in anticipation of a request from the peripheral device and thereby reduce the time between a request from the peripheral device and an I/O card acknowledgement. The I/O card and peripheral device communicate through packets that consist of a header comprising the starting address of the *buffer in the I/O card*, the data length, and the maximum data

¹ See Specification at Figure 7.

length of the packet buffer fields. The prefetch buffer in the I/O card has two buffer fields and represents shared memory with the peripheral device.

As discussed during the interview, EP560 does not teach or suggest the elements recited in Claim 1. In particular, EP560 does not read and buffer data in an interface circuit but, rather, prefetches and stores data within an input/output card. Consequently, Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable over EP560.

Amended Claims 5 and 9 include features additional to those of Claim 1 as well as features that are similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1. As a result, Claims 5 and 9 are believed to be patentable over EP560 for at least the reasons cited for the patentability of Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 5 and 9, and all claims dependent therefrom, are patentable over EP560.

Finally, new Claim 14 has been added based on the interview which included a discussion of the present invention's capabilities which include reading data from multiple sectors, buffering the data into a dedicated sector area, and transmitting data upon request. Applicant respectfully submits that the art of record does not teach or suggest at least these features. Therefore, new Claim 14 is believed to be patentable over the art of record.

Application No. 10/743,828
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2007

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Ronald A. Rudder
Registration No. 45,618

I:\ATTY\UMP\247090US\247090US-POST-INTERVIEW_AMND1.DOC